FRAMEWORK FOR THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS UNDER TITLE XXI OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Preamble

Section 2108(a) of the Act provides that the State must assess the operation of the State child health plan in each fiscal year, and report to the Secretary, by January 1 following the end of the fiscal year, on the results of the assessment. In addition, this section of the Act provides that the State must assess the progress made in reducing the number of uncovered, low-income children.

To assist States in complying with the statute, the National Academy for State Health Policy (NASHP), with funding from the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, has coordinated an effort with States and CMS over the years to design and revise this Annual Report Template. Over time, the framework has been updated to reflect program maturation and corrected where difficulties with reporting have been identified.

The framework is designed to:

- Recognize the *diversity* of State approaches to SCHIP and allow States *flexibility* to highlight key accomplishments and progress of their SCHIP programs, AND
- Provide consistency across States in the structure, content, and format of the report, AND
- Build on data already collected by CMS quarterly enrollment and expenditure reports, AND
- Enhance accessibility of information to stakeholders on the achievements under Title XXI.

FRAMEWORK FOR THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS UNDER TITLE XXI OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

State/Territory:	South Dakota				
	(Name of State/Territory)				
The following Annual 2108(a)).					
	(Signature of Agency Head)				
SCHIP Program Nam	ne(s): M-SCHIP & S-SCHIP				
SCHIP Program Type	e:				
	SCHIP Medicaid Expansion Only				
	Separate Child Health Program OnlyCombination of the above				
	Combination of the above				
Reporting Period:	Federal Fiscal Year 2004 Note: Federal Fiscal Year 2004 starts 10/1/03 and ends 9/30/04.				
Contact Person/Title:	Larry Iversen, Division Director				
Address: 700 Gov	vernors Drive; Pierre, SD 57501				
Phone: (605) 773-	-3495 Fax: (605) 773-5246				
Email: medical@	dss.state.sd.us				
Submission Date:	January 7, 2005				

(Due to your CMS Regional Contact and Central Office Project Officer by January 1st of each year) Please copy Cynthia Pernice at NASHP (cpernice@nashp.org)

SECTION I: SNAPSHOT OF SCHIP PROGRAM AND CHANGES

1) To provide a summary at-a-glance of your SCHIP program characteristics, please provide the following information. You are encouraged to complete this table for the different SCHIP programs within your state, e.g., if you have two types of separate child health programs within your state with different eligibility rules. If you would like to make any comments on your responses, please explain in narrative below this table. Please note that the numbers in brackets, e.g., [500] are character limits in the State Annual Report Template System (SARTS). You will not be able to enter responses with characters greater than the limit indicated in the brackets.

	SC	SCHIP Medicaid Expansion Program			9	Separat	e Child Health	Progran	n		
						From	NA	% of FPL conception to birth	NA	% of FPL	
	From	134	% of FPL for infants	140	% of FPL	From	141	% of FPL for infants	200	% of FPL	
Eligibility	From	134	% of FPL for children ages 1 through 5	140	% of FPL	From	141	% of FPL for 1 through 5	200	% of FPL	
	From	101	% of FPL for children ages 6 through 16	140	% of FPL	From	141	% of FPL for children ages 6 through 16	200	% of FPL	
	From	101	% of FPL for children ages 17 and 18	140	% of FPL	From	141	% of FPL for children ages 17 and 18	200	% of FPL	
Is presumptive eligibility	х	No				х	No				
provided for children?		Yes, fo	or whom and how	w long?			Yes, f	Yes, for whom and how long?			
		No					No				
Is retroactive eligibility available?	x	Yes, for whom and how long? Eligibility may begin up to the 1 st day of the 3 rd month prior to the application.			1 st ne	x	Yes, for whom and how long? Eligibility may begin up to the 1 st day of the 3 rd month prior to the application.			ne 1 st the	
Does your State Plan contain authority to			N 1 (P 11			Х	No				
implement a waiting list?			Not applicabl	e			Yes	Yes			
Does your program have		No					No				
a mail-in application?	X	Yes				x	Yes				
Can an applicant apply for your program over the	x	No				х	No				
phone?		Yes	Yes				Yes				

Does your program have an application on your website that can be		No					No				
printed, completed and mailed in?	x	Yes	3			х	Yes				
	x	No				х	No				
	Yes –	plea	se check all t	that apply	,	Yes – I	olease (check all	that ap	ply	
Can an applicant apply for your program on-line?			Signature pa mailed in Family docu mailed (i.e., in Electronic sign	mentation	imentation)		F r	Signature p ind mailed Family doc nailed (i.e. Electronic s No Signatu	in umentat income signature	tion mus docume e is req	st be ntation)
Does your program		NI.						NI-			
require a face-to-face interview during initial	X	No				Х		No			
application		Yes	3					Yes			
Does your program require a child to be	х		No					No			
uninsured for a minimum amount of time prior to			Yes			x		Yes			
enrollment (waiting period)?	Specif	fy nu	mber of mon	ths		Specify	/ numbe	er of mon	ths	3 mo	nths
	Х		No			х		No			
Does your program provide period of			Yes					Yes			
continuous coverage			Specify numl					fy numbe			
regardless of income changes?			rcumstances v luring the time			Explain circumstances when a child would lose eligibility during the time period in the box below					
·											
							1				
	Х		No Yes			Х	No Yes				
	Enrol	lmoni	t fee amount			Enrolla		amount			
Does your program			n amount			1	nium an				
require premiums or an enrollment fee?			ly cap				early ca				
	If yes,			structure ir	n the box below	If yes, b	riefly ex ding prei	-	llment fe	ee amo	
						I					

Does your program	х	No		х	No	
impose copayments or coinsurance?		Yes			Yes	
Does your program	x	No		l x	No	
impose deductibles?		Yes		<u> </u>	Yes	
·						
					T	
	Х	No		Х	No	
Does your program require an assets test?	15.) (Yes		16.) (Yes	
require air assets test?	If Ye	s, plea	ase describe below	If Yes	, please describe below	
		No			No	
	х	Yes		х	Yes	
Does your program					, please describe below	
require income disregards?			ss earnings or \$90 (whichever is		care paid due to employment (\$500	
disregards:			each adult who works; child care employment; \$50 of child support		num per month); \$50 of child support red (or actual amount if less than \$50);	
	received (or actual amount if less than \$50);			child support paid to another household		
	child	suppo	ort paid to another household			
	х	No		х	No	
			d out form to family with their pre-completed and		e send out form to family with their ation pre-completed and	
	IIIIOIII	lation (We send out form to family with] 111101111	We send out form to family	
Is a preprinted renewal			their information pre-completed		with their information pre-	
form sent prior to eligibility expiring?			and ask for confirmation		completed and ask for confirmation	
CAPITING:						
			We send out form but do not require a response unless income		We send out form but do not require a response unless	
					1040116 0 163001136 UHIC33	
			or other circumstances have		income or other circumstances	
			or other circumstances have changed			
Comments on Responses	in Tal	Je.			income or other circumstances	
•			changed		income or other circumstances	
•			changed		income or other circumstances	
Comments on Responses Attachment 1: 301-M; 301- 2. Is there an assets	R; 203	3-M; 20	changed		income or other circumstances	
Attachment 1: 301-M; 301- 2. Is there an assets	R; 203 test fo	3-<i>M</i>; 2 0	changed 04-M; 205-M	ram?	income or other circumstances have changed	
Attachment 1: 301-M; 301- 2. Is there an assets 3. Is it different from	R; 203 test fo	3-M; 20 or child	changed 04-M; 205-M dren in your Medicaid program?	ıram?	income or other circumstances have changed Yes X No	
Attachment 1: 301-M; 301- 2. Is there an assets 3. Is it different from 4. Are there income	R; 203 test for the as	3-M; 20 or child ssets to	changed 04-M; 205-M dren in your Medicaid program? est in your separate child health prog		income or other circumstances have changed Yes X No Yes X No Yes No X Yes No	
Attachment 1: 301-M; 301- 2. Is there an assets 3. Is it different from 4. Are there income 5. Are they different program?	R; 203 test for the as disreg	3-M; 20 or child ssets to pards for the income	changed 04-M; 205-M dren in your Medicaid program? est in your separate child health program your Medicaid program?	d health	income or other circumstances have changed Yes x No Yes x No x Yes No x Yes No x Yes No	

7. Have you made changes to any of the following policy or program areas during the reporting period? Please indicate "yes" or "no change" by marking appropriate column.

		Expa	licaid Insion Program	Child	arate Health gram
		Yes	No	Yes	No
a)	Applicant and enrollee protections (e.g., changed from the Medicaid Fair Hearing Process to State Law)		Change		Change X
b)	Application		x		х
c)	Benefit structure		х		х
d)	Cost sharing (including amounts, populations, & collection process)		x		x
e)	Crowd out policies		X		x
f)	Delivery system		X		х
g)	Eligibility determination process (including implementing a waiting lists or open enrollment periods)		X		х
h)	Eligibility levels / target population		X		x
i)	Assets test in Medicaid and/or SCHIP		X		х
j)	Income disregards in Medicaid and/or SCHIP		x		х
k)	Eligibility redetermination process		X		х
l)	Enrollment process for health plan selection		х		х
m)	Family coverage		X		x
n)	Outreach (e.g., decrease funds, target outreach)		x		x
o)	Premium assistance		x		х
p)	Prenatal Eligibility expansion		x		х
	SCHIP Annual Report Template – FFY 2004		6		

q) \	Vaiver populations (funded under title XXI)		х		х
	Parents		х		х
	Pregnant women		х		х
	Childless adults		х		х
r) Other – please specify			-	
•	a.				
	b.				<u> </u>
					<u> </u>
	C				
8. F	or each topic you responded yes to above, please ex	xplain the change and why the ch	nange was made, belo	ow:	
a) (e.g Lav	Applicant and enrollee protections ., changed from the Medicaid Fair Hearing Process to State v)	No Change			
b)	Application	No Change			
		<u> </u>			
	Benefit structure	No Change			
d)	Cost sharing (including amounts, populations, & collection process)	No Change			
e)	Crowd out policies	No Change			
f)	Delivery system	No Change			
_					
g) (inc	Eligibility determination process luding implementing a waiting lists or open enrollment periods)	No Change			
h)	Eligibility levels / target population	No Change			
i) 	Assets test in Medicaid and/or SCHIP	No Change			
j)	Income disregards in Medicaid and/or SCHIP	No Change			
k)	Eligibility redetermination process	No Change			

l)	Enrollment process for health plan selection	No Change
m)	Family coverage	No Change
n)	Outreach	No Change
0)	Premium assistance	No Change
p)	Prenatal Eligibility Expansion	No Change
q)	Waiver populations (funded under title XXI)	
	Parents	No Change
	Pregnant women	No Change
	Childless adults	No Change
r)	Other – please specify	
	a.	No Change
	b.	No Change
	C.	No Change

Attachment 1: 301-M; 301-R; 203-M; 204-M; 205-M

SECTION II: PROGRAM'S PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND PROGRESS

This section consists of three sub sections that gather information on the core performance measures for the SCHIP program as well as your State's progress toward meeting its general program strategic objectives and performance goals. Section IIA captures data on the core performance measures to the extent data are available. Section IIB captures your enrollment progress as well as changes in the number and/or rate of uninsured children in your State. Section IIC captures progress towards meeting your State's general strategic objectives and performance goals.

Please note that the numbers in brackets, e.g., [500] are character limits in the State Annual Report Template System (SARTS). You will not be able to enter responses with characters greater than the limit indicated in the brackets.

SECTION IIA: REPORTING OF CORE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

CMS is directed to examine national performance measures by the SCHIP Final Rules of January 11, 2001. To address this SCHIP directive, and to address the need for performance measurement in Medicaid, CMS, along with other Federal and State officials, developed a core set of performance measures for Medicaid and SCHIP. The group focused on well-established measures whose results could motivate agencies, providers, and health plans to improve the quality of care delivered to enrollees. After receiving comments from Medicaid and SCHIP officials on an initial list of 19 measures, the group recommended seven core measures, including four child health measures and three adult measures:

Child Health Measures

- Well child visits in the first 15 months of life
- Well child visits in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th years of life
- Use of appropriate medications for children with asthma
- Children's access to primary care practitioners

Adult Measures

- Comprehensive diabetes care (hemoglobin A1c tests)
- · Adult access to preventive/ambulatory health services
- Prenatal and postpartum care (prenatal visits)

These measures are based on specifications provided by the Health Plan Employer Data and Information Set (HEDIS®). HEDIS® provides a useful framework for defining and measuring performance. However, use of HEDIS® methodology is <u>not</u> required for reporting on your measures. The HEDIS® methodology can also be modified based on the availability of data in your State.

The table should be completed as follows:

Column 1: If you cannot provide a specific measure, please check the boxes that apply to your State for each performance measure, as follows:

- <u>Population not covered</u>: Check this box if your program does not cover the population included in the measure. For example, if your State does not cover adults under SCHIP, check the box indicating, "population not covered" for the three adult measures.
- <u>Data not available</u>: Check this box if data are not available for a particular measure in your State. Please provide an explanation of why the data are currently not available.
- Not able to report due to small sample size: Check this box if the sample size (i.e., denominator) for a particular measure is less than 30. If the sample size is less 30, your State is not required to report data on the measure. However, please indicate the exact sample size in the space provided.
- Other: Please specify if there is another reason why your state cannot report the measure.

Column 2:

For each performance measure listed in Column 1, please indicate the measurement specification (i.e., were the measures calculated using the HEDIS® technical specifications, HEDIS®-like specifications, or some other source with measurement specifications unrelated to HEDIS®). If the measures were calculated using HEDIS® or HEDIS®-like specifications, please indicate which version was used (e.g., HEDIS® 2004).

Column 3:

For each performance measure listed in Column 1, please indicate the data source(s); the definition of the population included in the measure (such as age, continuous enrollment, type of delivery system); the baseline measurement and baseline year; and your current performance, including the date of the most recent data reported. For rates, please specify the numerator and denominator that were used to calculate the rates. Please also note any comments on the performance measures or progress, such as data limitations, comparisons with external benchmarks, etc. and an explanation for changes from the baseline. Note: you do not need to report data for all delivery system types. You may choose to report data for only the delivery system with the most enrollees in your program.

NOTE:

Please do not reference attachments in this table. If details about a particular measure are located in an attachment, please summarize the relevant information from the attachment in the space provided for each measure.

Measure	Measurement Specification	Performance Measures and Progress
Well child visits in the first 15 months of life	X HEDIS Specify version of HEDIS used:	Data Source(s): HEDIS 2005; SD MMIS & MR63 10/01/2003-09/30/2004
Not Reported Because: Population not covered Data not available Explain: Not able to report due to small sample size (less than 30) Specify sample size: Other Explain:	□ HEDIS-Like Explain how HEDIS was modified: Specify version of HEDIS used: □ Other Explain:	Definition of Population Included in Measure: SCHIP enrollees ages 0 through 15 months who were continuously enrolled in Primary Care Case Management (PCCM) in September 2004 who received at least one well child visit during the FFY 2004 reporting period. Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates) This is the first year SD has conducted a study meeting this criteria and with current HEDIS sources and standards. FFY 2004: There were 212 recipients who qualified for this study. Of these, 201 recipients received at least 1 well-child visit, for a 95% utilization rate. Performance Progress/Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates) FFY 2004: There were 212 recipients who qualified for this study. Of these, 201 recipients received at least 1 well-child visit, for a 95% utilization rate.

Measure	Measurement Specification	Performance Measures and Progress
		# Visits # Recipients Utilization Rate 6 or more 96 46% 5 24 11% 4 28 13% 3 18 8% 2 18 8% 1 17 8% 0 11 5% Explanation of Progress: This is the first year SD has conducted a study meeting this criteria and with current HEDIS sources and standards. Other Comments on Measure: See Attachment 4: Well-Child Visits in the first 15 months of life
Measure	Measurement Specification	Performance Measures and Progress
Well child visits in children the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th years of life Not Reported Because: Population not covered Data not available Explain: Not able to report due to small sample size (less than 30) Specify sample size: Other Explain:	Measurement Specification X HEDIS Specify version of HEDIS used: □ HEDIS-Like Explain how HEDIS was modified: Specify version of HEDIS used: □ Other Explain:	Data Source(s): HEDIS 2005; SD MMIS & MR63 10/01/2003-09/30/2004 Definition of Population Included in Measure: SCHIP enrollees ages 3 through 6 who were continuously enrolled in Primary Care Case Management (PCCM) in September 2004 who received at least one well-child visit during the FFY 2004 reporting period. Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates) FFY 2003: M-SCHIP: There were 663 recipients who qualified for this study. Of these, 184 recipients received at least 1 well-child visit, for a 27% utilization rate S-SCHIP: There were 226 recipients who qualified for this study. Of these, 75 recipients received at least 1 well-child visit, for a 33% utilization rate Total SCHIP: There were 889 recipients who qualified for this study. Of these, 259 recipients received at least 1 well-child visit, for a 29% utilization rate

Measure	Measurement Specification	Performance Measures and Progress
		Performance Progress/Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		FFY 2004: M-SCHIP: There were 460 recipients who qualified for this study. Of these, 124 recipients received at least 1 well-child visit, for a 27% utilization rate
		S-SCHIP: There were 147 recipients who qualified for this study. Of these, 56 recipients received at least 1 well-child visit, for a 38% utilization rate
		Total SCHIP: There were 607 recipients who qualified for this study. Of these, 180 recipients received at least 1 well-child visit, for a 30% utilization rate
		Explanation of Progress:
		FFY 2003 FFY 2004 % increase M-SCHIP 27% 27% 0% S-SCHIP 33% 38% 6% Total SCHIP 29% 30% 1%
		Other Comments on Measure: See <u>Attachment 4:</u> Well-Child Visits in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th years of life
Use of appropriate medications for children with asthma Not Reported Because:	X HEDIS Specify version of HEDIS used:	Data Source(s): Hedis 2005; SD MMIS & MR63 10/01/2003-09/30/2004
 Population not covered Data not available Explain: Not able to report due to small sample size (less than 30) Specify sample size: Other Explain: 	 □ HEDIS-Like Explain how HEDIS was modified: Specify version of HEDIS used: □ Other Explain: 	Definition of Population Included in Measure: SCHIP enrollees ages 5-17 continuously enrolled in M-SCHIP and S-SCHIP during fiscal year 2004 who were identified as having persistent asthma during the year prior to the measurement year and who were appropriately prescribed medication during the measurement year.
		Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		This is the first year SD has conducted a study meeting this criteria and with current HEDIS sources and standards.

Measure	Measurement Specification	Performance Measures and Progress
		Performance Progress/Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		There were 45 recipients that met the study criteria as having persistent asthma.
		Number and percentage of recipients that received at least 1 prescription for anti-inflammatory medications:
		21 total recipients ages 5-9: 17 recipients 81% 24 total recipients ages 10-17: 20 recipients 83% 45 total all age categories: 37 recipients 82%
		Of the 45 total recipients that meet the study criteria, 11 recipients had a total of 12 emergency room visits for an ER utilization rate of 24%.
		Explanation of Progress: This is the first year SD has conducted a study meeting this criteria and with current HEDIS sources and standards.
		Other Comments on Measure: See <u>Attachment 4:</u> Use of Appropriate Medications for Children with Asthma
Children's access to primary care practitioners Not Reported Because:	X HEDIS Specify version of HEDIS used:	Data Source(s): Hedis 2005; SD MMIS & MR63 10/01/2003-09/30/2004
 □ Population not covered □ Data not available Explain: □ Not able to report due to small sample size (less than 30) Specify sample size: □ Other 	 □ HEDIS-Like Explain how HEDIS was modified: Specify version of HEDIS used: □ Other Explain: 	Definition of Population Included in Measure: SCHIP enrollees 12 to 24 months, 25 months to 6 years, 7 to 11 years, and 12 to 19 years of age that were continuously enrolled during fiscal year 2004 who had a visit with a primary care practitioner.
Explain:		Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		This is the first year SD has conducted a study meeting this criteria and with current HEDIS sources and standards.

Measure	Measurement Specification	Performance Measures and Progress
		Performance Progress/Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
Adult Comprehensive diabetes care (hemoglobin A1c tests) Not Reported Because:	□ HEDIS Specify version of HEDIS used:	Age # recipients # accessing PCP % 12-14 mo 181 168 93% 25 mo-6 yr 773 614 79% 7-11 yr 1,147 783 68% 12-19 yr 1,166 807 69% Total 3,267 2,372 73% The average Managed Care participation rate for M-SCHIP and S-SCHIP from federal fiscal years 2000-2004 is 99.2%. Explanation of Progress: This is the first year SD has conducted a study meeting this criteria and with current HEDIS sources and standards. Other Comments on Measure: See Attachment 4: Children's Access to Primary Care Practitioners See Attachment 2: Managed Care Participation Enrollment Averages Data Source(s):
X Population not covered Data not available Explain: Not able to report due to small sample size (less than 30) Specify sample size: Other Explain:	 □ HEDIS-Like Explain how HEDIS was modified: Specify version of HEDIS used: □ Other Explain: 	Measure: Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates) Performance Progress/Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		Explanation of Progress: Other Comments on Measure:

Measure	Measurement Specification	Performance Measures and Progress
Adult access to preventive/ambulatory health services	□ HEDIS Specify version of HEDIS used:	Data Source(s):
Not Reported Because:	□ HEDIS-Like Explain how HEDIS was modified:	Definition of Population Included in Measure:
X Population not covered □ Data not available Explain: □ Not able to report due to small sample size (less than 30) Specify sample size: □ Other	Specify version of HEDIS used: □ Other Explain:	Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
Explain:		Performance Progress/Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		Explanation of Progress:
		Other Comments on Measure:
Adult Prenatal and postpartum care (prenatal visits): Coverage for pregnant women over age 19 through a demonstration Coverage for unborn children through the SCHIP state plan Coverage for pregnant women under age 19 through the SCHIP state plan	□ HEDIS Specify version of HEDIS used: □ HEDIS-Like Explain how HEDIS was modified: Specify version of HEDIS used: □ Other Explain:	Data Source(s): Definition of Population Included in Measure: Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
Not Reported Because:		
X Population not covered □ Data not available Explain: □ Not able to report due to small sample size (less than 30) Specify sample size:		Performance Progress/Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
□ Other Explain:		Explanation of Progress:
		Other Comments on Measure:

SECTION IIB: ENROLLMENT AND UNINSURED DATA

1. The information in the table below is the Unduplicated Number of Children Ever Enrolled in SCHIP in your State for the two most recent reporting periods. The enrollment numbers reported below should correspond to line 7 in your State's 4th quarter data report (submitted in October) in the SCHIP Statistical Enrollment Data System (SEDS). The percent change column reflects the percent change in enrollment over the two-year period. If the percent change exceeds 10 percent (increase or decrease), please explain in letter A below any factors that may account for these changes (such as decreases due to elimination of outreach or increases due to program expansions). This information will be filled in automatically by SARTS through a link to SEDS. Please wait until you have an enrollment number from SEDS before you complete this response.

Program	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	Percent change FFY 2003-2004
SCHIP Medicaid Expansion Program	9,529	10,293	8.02%
Separate Child Health Program	2,759	3,043	10.29%

A. Please explain any factors that may account for enrollment increases or decreases exceeding 10 percent.

During federal fiscal year 2004, the economy of South Dakota continued to suffer as a result of a major drought throughout much of the state in years 2001 through 2003. The drought has had a significant impact on South Dakota's agriculturally-based economy. Farmers and ranchers of South Dakota have not fully recovered from the severe losses suffered in previous years. As a result, more and more families qualified for medical assistance programs. Since agriculture drives South Dakota's economy, this has a tumbling effect on other industries in the state. The summer of 2004 was more productive for farmers and ranchers, and South Dakota's economy has begun to rebound recently, although not as quickly as we'd like.

2. Three-year averages in the number and/or rate of uninsured children in each state based on the Current Population Survey (CPS) are shown in the table below, along with the percent change between 1996-1998 and 2001-2003. Significant changes are denoted with an asterisk (*). If your state uses an alternate data source and/or methodology for measuring change in the number and/or rate of uninsured children, please explain in Question #3. SARTS will fill in this information automatically, but in the meantime, please refer to the CPS data attachment that was sent with the FY 2004 Annual Report Template.

	Uninsured Children Under Age 19 Below 200 Percent of Poverty		Uninsured Children Under Age 19 Below 200 Percent of Poverty as a Percent of Total Children Under Age 19	
Period	Number	Std. Error	Rate	Std. Error
1996-1998	12,000	2.9%	6.1%	1.5%
1997-1999	12,000	3.0%	6.1%	1.5%
2000-2002	9,000	1.8%	4.7%	.9%
2001-2003	9,000	1.8%	4.4%	.9%
Percent change 1996-1998 vs. 2001-2003	-25.0%	NA	-27.8%	NA

- A. Please note any comments here concerning CPS data limitations that may affect the reliability or precision of these estimates.
- 3. If your State has an alternate data source and/or methodology for measuring change in the number and/or rate of uninsured children, please report in the table below. Data are required for two or more points in time to demonstrate change (or lack of change). Please be as specific and detailed as possible about the method used to measure progress toward covering the uninsured.

Data source(s)	
Reporting period (2 or more	
points in time)	
Methodology	
Population	
Sample sizes	
Number and/or rate for two or	
more points in time	
Statistical significance of results	

- A. Please explain why the state chose to adopt a different methodology to measure changes in the number and/or rate of uninsured children.
- B. What is the State's assessment of the reliability of the estimate? What are the limitations of the data or estimation methodology? (Provide a numerical range or confidence intervals if available.)

4. How many children do you estimate have been enrolled in Medicaid as a result of SCHIP outreach activities and enrollment simplification? Describe the data source and method used to derive this information. (States with only a SCHIP Medicaid Expansion Program should skip this question)

The only way South Dakota can measure effectiveness with these families is with anecdotal information on how they learned about the program. Local offices keep track of Internet applications as they are aware of them. The Monthly Department SCHIP survey has questions regarding how families heard about the SCHIP program and where they got the application.

<u>Attachment 6:</u> SCHIP Stuffer; SCHIP Department Survey; SCHIP Department Survey Comparison Chart

<u>Attachment 12:</u> Various SCHIP Outreach Information

SECTION IIC: STATE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE GOALS

In the table below, summarize your State's general strategic objectives, performance goals, performance measures and progress towards meeting goals, as specified in your SCHIP State Plan. Use additional pages as necessary. Please do not reference attachments in this table. If details about a particular measure are located in an attachment, please summarize the relevant information from the attachment in the space provided for each measure. The table should be completed as follows:

Column 1: List your State's general strategic objectives for your SCHIP program and indicate if the strategic objective listed is new/revised or continuing. If you have met your goal and/or are discontinuing a strategic objective or goal, please continue to list the objective/goal in the space provided below, and indicate that it has been discontinued, and provide the reason why it was discontinued. Also, if you have revised a goal, please check "new/revised" and explain how and why it was revised.

Note: States are required to report objectives related to reducing the number of uninsured children. (This/these measure(s) should reflect what was reported in Section IIB, Question(s) 2 and 3. <u>Progress</u> towards reducing the number of uninsured children should be reported in this section.)

Column 2: List the performance goals for each strategic objective. Where applicable, provide the measurement specification (i.e., were the measures calculated using the HEDIS® technical specifications, HEDIS®-like specifications, or some other source with measurement specifications unrelated to HEDIS®).

Column 3: For each performance goal listed in Column 1, please indicate the data source(s); the definition of the population included in the measure (such as age, continuous enrollment, type of delivery system); the methodology used; the baseline measurement and baseline year; and your current performance, including the date of the most recent data reported. For rates, please specify the numerator and denominator that were used to calculate the rates. Please note any comments on the performance measures or progress, such as data limitations, comparisons with external benchmarks, or the like.

(1) Strategic Objectives (specify if it is a new/revised objective or a continuing objective)

(2) Performance Goals for each Strategic Objective

(3) Performance Measures and Progress (Specify Data Sources, methodology, time period, etc.)

Objectives Related to Reducing the Number of Uninsured Children (Mandatory for all states for each reporting year) (This/these measure(s) should reflect what was reported in Section IIB, Question(s) 2 and 3.)

- □ New/revised
- **X** Continuing
- □ Discontinued Explain:

Achieve a measurable reduction in the number of uninsured children in South Dakota.

Goal #1:

M-SCHIP: Continue to extend Medicaid to uninsured children age 0 through 18 at Medicaid eligibility levels in effect prior to 07/01/1998, and other low income children from 133% to 140% of the federal poverty level as amended effective 04/01/1999.

S-SCHIP: Implement S-SCHIP to provide coverage to an additional 2,400 targeted, uninsured children in families with incomes from 140% to 200% of the federal poverty level beginning 07/01/2000.

Continue to extend SCHIP benefits to targeted, uninsured, non-Medicaid eligible children age 6 through 18 in families with incomes from 100% to 133% of the federal poverty levels; and to targeted, uninsured, non-Medicaid eligible children age 0 through 18 in families with incomes from 133% to 140% as amended effective 04/01/1999.

Data Source(s):

US Census Bureau Current Population Survey, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004. SD MMIS & MR 63: 07/1998 - 09/2004.

Definition of Population Included in Measure: M-SCHIP: includes children ages 0-5 134-140% FPL and children ages 6-18 101-140% FPL

S-SCHIP: includes children ages 0-18 141-200% FPL

Medicaid: includes children ages 0-5 up to 133% FPL and children ages 6-18 up to 100% with the exception of children eligible for SSI

Methodology:

Reduce 1998 CPS baseline by actual enrollments in M-SCHIP. Further reduce uninsured children by actual enrollments in S-SCHIP.

(1) Strategic Objectives (specify if it is a new/revised objective or a continuing objective)	(2) Performance Goals for each Strategic Objective	(3) Performance Measures and Progress (Specify Data Sources, methodology, time period, etc.)
		Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		Three-year average for 1996, 1997, and 1998
		Total number of children under 19 years at all income levels: 197,000
		Number of children at or below 200% FPL: 74,000
		Percentage of children at or below 200% FPL: 37.8%
		Number of above children without health insurance: 12,000
		Percentage of above children without health insurance: 6.1%
		Performance Progress / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		Total children under 19 years (all income levels): 1996-1998 197,000 1997-1999 197,000 1998-2000 193,000 1999-2001 194,000 2000-2002 198,000 2001-2003 201,000
		Number & percentage children at or below 200% FPL: 1996-1998 74,000 37.8% 1997-1999 70,000 35.4%
		1998-2000 64,000 32.8% 1999-2001 63,000 32.3% 2000-2002 66,000 33.1% 2001-2003 66,000 33.0%
		Number & percentage children at or below 200% FPL without health insurance: 1996-1998 12,000 6.1% 1997-1999 12,000 6.1% 1998-2000 14,000 7.1% 1999-2001 9,000 4.8%
		2000-2002 9,000 4.7% 2001-2003 9,000 4.4%
		Explanation of Progress: The number of uninsured children dropped from 6.1% in years 1996-1998 to 4.4% in years 2001-2003, a 1.7% decrease in uninsured children statewide.
		Other Comments on Measure:

(1) Strategic Objectives (specify (2) Performance Goals for each (3) Performance Measures and Progress (Specify Data if it is a new/revised objective or Strategic Objective Sources, methodology, time period, etc.) a continuing objective) Data Source(s): □ New/revised Goal #2: US Census Bureau Current Population Survey. **X** Continuing 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, □ Discontinued 2003, 2004. SD MMIS & MR 63: 07/1998 -Explain: Continue to utilize a systematic 09/2004. approach to identify uninsured children with low incomes using Achieve a measurable **Definition of Population Included in Measure:** Department data resources, reduction in the number of M-SCHIP: includes children ages 0-5 134-140% partnerships with other public uninsured children in South FPL and children ages 6-18 101-140% FPL programs, and local involvement of Dakota. interested parties including schools, S-SCHIP: includes children ages 0-18 141-200% providers, and others to further **FPL** reduce the number of uninsured children in South Dakota. Medicaid: includes children ages 0-5 up to 133% FPL and children ages 6-18 up to 100% with the exception of children eligible for SSI Methodology: Reduce 1998 CPS baseline by actual enrollments in M-SCHIP. Further reduce uninsured children by actual enrollments in S-SCHIP. Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates) Three-year average for 1996, 1997, and 1998 Total number of children under 19 years at all income levels: 197,000 Number of children at or below 200% FPL: 74,000 Percentage of children at or below 200% FPL: 37.8% Number of above children without health insurance: 12,000 Percentage of above children without health insurance: 6.1% **Performance Progress / Year:** (Specify numerator and denominator for rates) Total children under 19 years (all income levels): 197,000 1996-1998 1997-1999 197,000 1998-2000 193,000 1999-2001 194,000 2000-2002 198,000 2001-2003 201,000 Number & percentage children at or below 200% FPL: 1996-1998 74,000 37.8% 1997-1999 70,000 35.4% 1998-2000 32.8% 64.000 32.3% 1999-2001 63.000

33.1%

33.0%

66,000

66,000

2000-2002

2001-2003

(1) Strategic Objectives (specify if it is a new/revised objective or a continuing objective)	(2) Performance Goals for each Strategic Objective	(3) Performance Measures and Progress (Specify Data Sources, methodology, time period, etc.)
		Number & percentage children at or below 200% FPL without health insurance: 1996-1998 12,000 6.1% 1997-1999 12,000 6.1% 1998-2000 14,000 7.1% 1999-2001 9,000 4.8% 2000-2002 9,000 4.7% 2001-2003 9,000 4.4% Explanation of Progress: The number of uninsured children dropped from 6.1% in years 1996-1998 to 4.4% in years 2001-2003, a 1.7% decrease in uninsured children statewide. Other Comments on Measure:
□ New/revised X Continuing □ Discontinued Explain: Achieve a measurable reduction in the number of uninsured children in South Dakota.	Goal #3: Expand the simplified medical assistance application process to include S-SCHIP the same as Medicaid and M-SCHIP medical assistance programs to further reduce the number of uninsured children in South Dakota.	Data Source(s): US Census Bureau Current Population Survey, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004. SD MMIS & MR 63: 07/1998 - 09/2004. Definition of Population Included in Measure: M-SCHIP: includes children ages 0-5 134-140% FPL and children ages 6-18 101-140% FPL
		S-SCHIP: includes children ages 0-18 141-200% FPL Medicaid: includes children ages 0-5 up to 133% FPL and children ages 6-18 up to 100% with the exception of children eligible for SSI
		Methodology: Reduce 1998 CPS baseline by actual enrollments in M-SCHIP. Further reduce uninsured children by actual enrollments in S-SCHIP.
		Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		Three-year average for 1996, 1997, and 1998
		Total number of children under 19 years at all income levels: 197,000
		Number of children at or below 200% FPL: 74,000
		Percentage of children at or below 200% FPL: 37.8%
		Number of above children without health insurance: 12,000
		Percentage of above children without health insurance: 6.1%

(1) Strategic Objectives (specify if it is a new/revised objective or a continuing objective)	(2) Performance Goals for each Strategic Objective	(3) Performance Measu Sources, methodology, ti	ures and Progr me period, etc.)	ess (Specify Data
		Performance Progre	ss / Year:	
		(Specify numerator ar		or for rates)
		(1)		,
		Total children under 19		<u>e levels)</u> :
		1996-1998	197,000	
		1997-1999	197,000	
		1998-2000	193,000	
		1999-2001	194,000	
		2000-2002	198,000	
		2001-2003	201,000	
		Number & percentage cl	hildren at or hel	ow 200% FPI ·
		1996-1998	74,000	37.8%
		1997-1999	70,000	35.4%
		1998-2000	64,000	32.8%
		1999-2001	63,000	32.3%
		2000-2002	66,000	33.1%
		2001-2003	66,000	33.0%
		Number & percentage cl without health insurance	hildren at or bel	ow 200% FPL
		1996-1998	12,000	6.1%
		1997-1999	12,000	6.1%
		1998-2000	14,000	7.1%
		1999-2001	9,000	4.8%
		2000-2002	9,000	4.7%
		2001-2003	9,000	4.4%
		Explanation of Programmer The number of uninsumber 1996-19	ired children d	
		2003, a 1.7% decreas wide.		
		Other Comments on	Measure:	

Objectives Related to SCHIP Enrollment (1) Strategic Objectives (specify (2) Performance Goals for each (3) Performance Measures and Progress (Specify Data if it is a new/revised objective or **Strategic Objective** Sources, methodology, time period, etc.) a continuing objective) Goal #1: □ New/revised Data Source(s): US Census Bureau Current Population Survey, **X** Continuina 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, □ Discontinued M-SCHIP: Continue to extend Explain: 2003, 2004. SD MMIS & MR 63: 07/1998 -Medicaid to uninsured children age 0 through 18 at Medicaid eligibility 09/2004. Achieve a measurable levels in effect prior to 07/01/1998, reduction in the number of and other low income children from **Definition of Population Included in Measure:** uninsured children in South 133% to 140% of the federal poverty M-SCHIP: includes children ages 0-5 134-140% Dakota. level as amended effective FPL and children ages 6-18 101-140% FPL 04/01/1999. Methodology: Reduce CPS baseline by actual enrollments in M-SCHIP. Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates) FFY 1998 M-SCHIP enrollment 903 **Performance Progress / Year:** (Specify numerator and denominator for rates) FFY 1998 M-SCHIP enrollment 903 FFY 1999 M-SCHIP enrollment 1.586 FFY 2000 M-SCHIP enrollment 1.891 FFY 2001 M-SCHIP enrollment 1,456 FFY 2002 M-SCHIP enrollment 1.044 FFY 2003 M-SCHIP enrollment 539 FFY 2004 M-SCHIP enrollment 603 Total M-SCHIP enrollment FFY 1998-2004 8,022 **Explanation of Progress:** Total M-SCHIP enrollment increase from implementation (FFY 1998 through FFY 2004) is 8,022. Other Comments on Measure: Goal #2: □ New/revised Data Source(s): **X** Continuina US Census Bureau Current Population Survey, S-SCHIP: Implement S-SCHIP as an □ Discontinued 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, additional effort to address the objectives Explain: 2003, 2004. SD MMIS & MR 63: 07/1998 stated in the original state plan effective 09/2004. 07/01/2000. Implement S-SCHIP to provide coverage to an additional 2,400 targeted, uninsured children in families with incomes Definition of Population Included in Measure: from 140% to 200% of the federal poverty level S-SCHIP: includes children ages 0-18 141-200% beginning 07/01/2000. **FPL**

	Methodology: Reduce CPS baseline by actual enrollments in S-SCHIP.
	Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)

FFY 2000 S-SCHIP enrollment 301

Performance Progress / Year:

(Specify numerator and denominator for rates)

FFY 2000 S-SCHIP enrollment 5.034 FFY 2001 S-SCHIP enrollment 5.30 FFY 2002 S-SCHIP enrollment 5.30 FFY 2003 S-SCHIP enrollment 5.30 FFY 2004 S-SCHIP enrollment 5.30

Total S-SCHIP FFY 1998-2004 2,163

Explanation of Progress:

Total S-SCHIP enrollment increase from implementation (FFY 2000 through FFY 2004) is 2,163.

Other Comments on Measure:

(1) Strategic Objectives (specify if it is a new/revised objective or a continuing objective)	(2) Performance Goals for each Strategic Objective	(3) Performance Measures and Progress (Specify Data Sources, methodology, time period, etc.)
□ New/revised	Goal #3:	Data Source(s):
☐ Continuing☐ Discontinued☐ Explain:		Definition of Population Included in Measure:
		Methodology:
		Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		Performance Progress / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		Explanation of Progress:
		Other Comments on Measure:
Objectives Related to Medicaid En	rollment	<u>I</u>
□ New/revised X Continuing □ Discontinued Explain: Achieve a measurable reduction in the number of uninsured children in South Dakota.	Goal #1: Continue to extend Medicaid to uninsured children age 0 through 18 at Medicaid eligibility levels in effect prior to 07/01/1998.	Data Source(s): US Census Bureau Current Population Survey, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004. SD MMIS & MR 63: 07/1998 - 09/2004. Definition of Population Included in Measure: Medicaid: includes children ages 0-5 up to 133% FPL and children ages 6-18 up to 100% with the exception of children eligible for SSI Methodology: Reduce CPS baseline by actual enrollments in Medicaid Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates) FFY 1998 Medicaid enrollment increase 1,188 Performance Progress / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates) FFY 1998 Medicaid enrollment increase 2,380 FFY 1999 Medicaid enrollment increase 3,960 FFY 2000 Medicaid enrollment increase 3,029 FFY 2003 Medicaid enrollment increase 1,1962 FFY 2004 Medicaid enrollment increase 1,066
		Total Medicaid enrollment FFY 1998-2004 15,850 Explanation of Progress: Total Medicaid enrollment increase from FFY 1998

(1) Strategic Objectives (specify if it is a new/revised objective or a continuing objective)	(2) Performance Goals for each Strategic Objective	(3) Performance Measures and Progress (Specify Data Sources, methodology, time period, etc.)
		through FFY 2004 is 15,850.
		Other Comments on Measure:
□ New/revised □ Continuing	Goal #2:	Data Source(s):
□ Discontinued Explain:		Definition of Population Included in Measure:
		Methodology:
		Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		Performance Progress / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		Explanation of Progress:
		Other Comments on Measure:
□ New/revised	Goal #3:	Data Source(s):
□ Continuing□ DiscontinuedExplain:		Definition of Population Included in Measure:
		Methodology:
		Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		Performance Progress / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		Explanation of Progress:
		Other Comments on Measure:

(1) Strategic Objectives (specify
if it is a new/revised objective or
a continuing objective)

(2) Performance Goals for each Strategic Objective

(3) Performance Measures and Progress (Specify Data Sources, methodology, time period, etc.)

Objectives Related to Increasing Access to Care (Usual Source of Care, Unmet Need)

- □ New/revised
- **X** Continuing
- □ Discontinued Explain:

Improve access to quality primary and preventive health care services for SCHIP eligible, new Medicaid eligibles, and previously non-enrolled children.

Goal #1:

- □ HEDIS
 - Specify version of HEDIS used:
- □ HEDIS-Like

Explain how HEDIS was modified:

Specify version of HEDIS used:

X Other

Explain:

M-SCHIP: Enroll all newly approved M-SCHIP children in the South Dakota medical assistance primary care case management program within 1 month of their enrollment.

S-SCHIP: Enroll 95% of all newly approved S-SCHIP children in the South Dakota medical assistance primary care case management program within 1 month of enrollment.

Data Source(s):

SD MMIS & MR 63: 07/1998 - 09/2004.

Definition of Population Included in Measure:

M-SCHIP: includes children ages 0-5 134-140% FPL and children ages 6-18 101-140% FPL

S-SCHIP: includes children ages 0-18 141-200% FPL

Methodology:

Increase participation in the South Dakota medical assistance primary care case management program

Baseline / Year:

(Specify numerator and denominator for rates)

Managed Care Participation Rate: M-SCHIP FFY 2000: 99.5% S-SCHIP FFY 2000: 99.9%

Performance Progress / Year:

(Specify numerator and denominator for rates)

Numerator: total number of children enrolled in the Managed Care Program

Denominator: total number of children enrolled in the M-SCHIP program and the S-SCHIP program

Managed Care Participation Rate:

M-SCHIP FFY 2000: 99.5% FFY 2001: 99.0% FFY 2002: 98.8% FFY 2003: 99.3%

S-SCHIP FFY 2000: 99.9%

FFY 2001: 98.5% FFY 2002: 99.2% FFY 2003: 99.4% FFY 2004: 99.2%

FFY 2004: 99.2%

<u>Attachment 2:</u> Primary Care Participation Enrollment Averages FFY 2004

<u>Attachment 4:</u> Children's Access to Primary Care Practitioners

Explanation of Progress:

Enrollment of M-SCHIP and S-SCHIP recipients in the South Dakota medical assistance primary care case management program remains relatively

(1) Strategic Objectives (specify if it is a new/revised objective or a continuing objective)	(2) Performance Goals for each Strategic Objective	(3) Performance Measures and Progress (Specify Data Sources, methodology, time period, etc.)
		consistent from FFY 2000-2004.
		Other Comments on Measure:
□ New/revised X Continuing □ Discontinued Explain:	Goal #2: HEDIS Specify version of HEDIS used: HEDIS-Like Explain how HEDIS was modified: Specify version of HEDIS used: X Other Explain: Develop capability to measure access to coverage for American Indian children in South Dakota by working jointly with the Indian Health Service (IHS), Tribal governments, and Urban Indian Health (UIH) clinics.	
		have not selected those providers as their PCP. There are 38.2%, or 667 out of 1,747 American Indian M-SCHIP recipients using IHS and UIH facilities as of 09/30/2004. There are 34.2%, or 117 out of 342 American Indian S-SCHIP recipients using IHS and UIH facilities as of 09/30/2004. Explanation of Progress: Use of IHS and UIH facilities by American Indian children enrolled in M-SCHIP increased by 0.3% since FFY 2002. Use of IHS and UIH facilities by American Indian children enrolled in S-SCHIP increased by 1.4% since FFY 2002.

(1) Strategic Objectives (specify if it is a new/revised objective or a continuing objective)	(2) Performance Goals for each Strategic Objective	(3) Performance Measures and Progress (Specify Data Sources, methodology, time period, etc.)
		Other Comments on Measure: See <u>Attachment 2:</u> Managed Care Participation Enrollment Averages; Indian Health Service (IHS) Primary Care Provider (PCP) List; Number and Type of PCPs
□ New/revised □ Continuing	Goal #3:	Data Source(s):
□ Discontinued Explain:	□ HEDIS Specify version of HEDIS used:	Definition of Population Included in Measure:
	□ HEDIS-Like Explain how HEDIS was modified:	Methodology:
	Specify version of HEDIS used:	Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
	□ Other Explain:	
		Performance Progress / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		Explanation of Progress:
		Other Comments on Measure:

Objectives Related to Use of Preventative Care (Immunizations, Well Child Care) (1) Strategic Objectives (specify (2) Performance Goals for each (3) Performance Measures and Progress (Specify Data if it is a new/revised objective or Strategic Objective Sources, methodology, time period, etc.) a continuing objective) □ New/revised Goal #1: Data Source(s): HEDIS 2005; SD MMIS & MR63 10/01/2003-**X** Continuing 09/30/2004 □ Discontinued Explain: X HEDIS Specify version of HEDIS used: **Definition of Population Included in Measure:** SCHIP enrollees 12 to 24 months, 25 months to 6 Improve access to quality years, 7 to 11 years, and 12 to 19 years of age that □ HEDIS-Like primary and preventive health were continuously enrolled during fiscal year 2004 Explain how HEDIS was modified: care services for SCHIP (allowing no more than on gap in enrollment of up eligible, new Medicaid eligibles, to 45 days during the measurement year) who had Specify version of HEDIS used: and previously non-enrolled a visit with an MCO primary care practitioner. children. □ Other Methodology: Explain: Includes children ages 12 months through 19 years enrolled in M-SCHIP and S-SCHIP who also fall Ensure each new SCHIP enrollee and under the Managed Care guidelines and were new Medicaid eligibles receive EPSDT information at the time that continuously participating from October 1, 2003, their eligibility is approved. through September 30, 2004. Results were obtained by reviewing claims data specifically looking for codes identifying an ambulatory or preventive care visit with primary care physicians. Baseline / Year: (Specify numerator and denominator for rates) This is the first year SD has conducted a study meeting this criteria and with current HEDIS sources and standards. **Performance Progress / Year:** (Specify numerator and denominator for rates) # recipients # accessing PCP 12-14 mo 93% 181 168 79% 25 mo-6 yr 773 614 7-11 yr 1,147 783 68% 12-19 yr 1,166 807 69% Total 3.267 2.372 73% The average Managed Care participation rate for M-SCHIP and S-SCHIP from federal fiscal years 2000-2004 is 99.2%. **Explanation of Progress:** This is the first year SD has conducted a study meeting this criteria and with current HEDIS sources and standards. Other Comments on Measure: See Attachment 4: Children's Access to Primary Care Practitioners

- □ New/revised
- □ Continuing
- □ Discontinued Explain:

Improve access to quality primary and preventive health care services for SCHIP eligible, new Medicaid eligibles, and previously non-enrolled children.

Goal #2:

X HEDIS

Specify version of HEDIS used:

□ HEDIS-Like Explain how HEDIS was modified:

Specify version of HEDIS used:

□ Other Explain:

Include S-SCHIP eligible children in the quality measurement mechanisms that are used for Medicaid and M-SCHIP including measures of immunization, well-child care, adolescent well care, satisfaction and other measures of health care quality.

Data Source(s):

HEDIS 2005; SD MMIS & MR63 10/01/2003-09/30/2004

Definition of Population Included in Measure:

See <u>Attachment 4:</u> Well-Child Visits in the first 15 months of life; Well-Child Visits in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th years of life; Use of Appropriate Medications for Children with Asthma; Children's Access to Primary Care Practitioners

Methodology:

See <u>Attachment 4:</u> Well-Child Visits in the first 15 months of life; Well-Child Visits in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th years of life; Use of Appropriate Medications for Children with Asthma; Children's Access to Primary Care Practitioners

Baseline / Year:

(Specify numerator and denominator for rates)

See <u>Attachment 4:</u> Well-Child Visits in the first 15 months of life; Well-Child Visits in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th years of life; Use of Appropriate Medications for Children with Asthma; Children's Access to Primary Care Practitioners

Performance Progress / Year:

(Specify numerator and denominator for rates)

See <u>Attachment 4:</u> Well-Child Visits in the first 15 months of life; Well-Child Visits in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th years of life; Use of Appropriate Medications for Children with Asthma; Children's Access to Primary Care Practitioners

Explanation of Progress:

See <u>Attachment 4:</u> Well-Child Visits in the first 15 months of life; Well-Child Visits in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th years of life; Use of Appropriate Medications for Children with Asthma; Children's Access to Primary Care Practitioners

Other Comments on Measure:

See <u>Attachment 4:</u> Well-Child Visits in the first 15 months of life; Well-Child Visits in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th years of life; Use of Appropriate Medications for Children with Asthma; Children's Access to Primary Care Practitioners

(1) Strategic Objectives (specify if it is a new/revised objective or a continuing objective)	(2) Performance Goals for each Strategic Objective	(3) Performance Measures and Progress (Specify Data Sources, methodology, time period, etc.)
□ New/revised	Goal #3:	Data Source(s):
□ Continuing		
□ Discontinued Explain:	□ HEDIS	Definition of Population Included in Measure:
·	Specify version of HEDIS used:	·
	│ │ □ HEDIS-Like	Methodology:
	Explain how HEDIS was modified:	
	·	Baseline / Year:
	Specify version of HEDIS used:	(Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
	□ Other	
	Explain:	
		Performance Progress / Year:
		(Specify numerator and denominator for rates)
		Explanation of Progress:
		Other Comments on Measure:

1. What other strategies does your state use to measure and report on access to, quality, or outcomes of care received by your SCHIP population? What have you found?

Access to quality primary and preventive health services is measured by the number of new SCHIP children enrolled in the Medical Assistance Primary Care Case Management system. The State ensures that managed care beneficiaries have appropriate access to covered services. Access is monitored through complaint resolution, surveys, change request reasons, and caseload monitoring. Utilization based studies for well child screenings are used to provide additional measurement of access to and quality of services.

<u>Attachment 4:</u> Studies: Well-Child Visits in the first 15 months of life; Well-Child Visits in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th years of life; Use of Appropriate Medications for Children with Asthma; Children's Access to Primary Care Practitioners

Department surveys with questions relating to access of care and satisfaction of care are sent to households of SCHIP recipients. The Department survey had previously been done on a yearly basis. In June, 2001, the survey was implemented on a monthly schedule and is sent to 100 randomly selected SCHIP households. A Disenrollee Survey was developed and implemented September, 2000. This is sent out monthly to a random sample of SCHIP recipients that are no longer enrolled in the program.

<u>Attachment 6:</u> SCHIP Stuffer; SCHIP Department Survey; SCHIP Department Survey Comparison Chart

<u>Attachment 7:</u> Disenrollee Survey Caretaker Cover Letter; Disenrollee Survey; Disenrollee Survey Comparison Chart

2. What strategies does your SCHIP program have for future measurement and reporting on access to, quality, or outcomes of care received by your SCHIP population? When will data be available?

M-SCHIP and S-SCHIP enrollees are included in the State's Medical Assistance Primary Care Case Management (PCCM) system. The state will continue with quality assurance studies for future measurement of the access to, or the quality of care received by our SCHIP population. These results will continue to be reported in the annual reporting requirements.

Department surveys with questions relating to access of care and satisfaction of care will continue to be sent to households of SCHIP recipients on a monthly basis. The Disenrollee Survey will also continue to be sent on a monthly basis to families with children that are no longer enrolled in the program. Survey results will continue to be reported in the annual reporting requirements.

3. Have you conducted any focused quality studies on your SCHIP population, e.g., adolescents, attention deficit disorder, substance abuse, special heath care needs or other emerging health care needs? What have you found?

Quality assurance studies continue to be done in a number of areas. Examples of the studies for SCHIP recipients that have been completed include Well-Child Visits in the first 15 months of life; Well-Child Visits in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th years of life; Use of Appropriate Medications for Children with Asthma; and Children's Access to Primary Care Practitioners. We will continue these Quality Assurance studies and will pursue action to obtain measurable improvement. Future study results will be included with reporting requirements. (See Attachment 4 for results of some of these studies.)

4. Please attach any additional studies, analyses or other documents addressing outreach, enrollment, access, quality, utilization, costs, satisfaction, or other aspects of your SCHIP program's performance. Please list attachments here and summarize findings or list main findings.

<u>Attachment 4:</u> Studies: Well-Child Visits in the first 15 months of life; Well-Child Visits in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th years of life; Use of Appropriate Medications for Children with Asthma; Children's Access to Primary Care Practitioners

<u>Attachment 6:</u> SCHIP Stuffer; SCHIP Department Survey; SCHIP Department Survey Comparison Chart

<u>Attachment 7:</u> Disenrollee Survey Caretaker Cover Letter; Disenrollee Survey; Disenrollee Survey Comparison Chart

Attachment 8: South Dakota State Plan Amendment for Managed Care

SECTION III: ASSESSMENT OF STATE PLAN AND PROGRAM OPERATION

Please reference and summarize attachments that are relevant to specific questions

Please note that the numbers in brackets, e.g., [7500] are character limits in the State Annual Report Template System (SARTS). You will not be able to enter responses with characters greater than the limit indicated in the brackets.

OUTREACH

1. How have you redirected/changed your outreach strategies during the reporting period?

There were no changes during this reporting period.

2. What methods have you found most effective in reaching low-income, uninsured children (e.g., T.V., school outreach, word-of-mouth)? How have you measured effectiveness?

Since the inception of the SCHIP program, the State has used a number of approaches to conduct outreach to clients in addition to collaboration with other health or children's programs. Included among the outreach approaches are direct mailings by the State to clients, the use of brochures and posters, client education sessions, an eligibility 800-telephone number, ads on public access television, paid radio announcements and public service announcements. Most effective among these efforts are the education sessions, direct mailings, the use of brochures, and collaborations with other programs.

The only way South Dakota can measure effectiveness with these families is with anecdotal information on how they learned about the program. Local offices keep track of Internet applications as they are aware of them. The Monthly Department SCHIP survey has questions regarding how families heard about the SCHIP program and where they got the application.

<u>Attachment 6:</u> SCHIP Stuffer; SCHIP Department Survey; SCHIP Department Survey Comparison Chart

3. Is your state targeting outreach to specific populations (e.g., minorities, immigrants, and children living in rural areas)? Have these efforts been successful, and how have you measured effectiveness?

IHS and Tribal medical providers help reach American Indian populations. Contacts with health providers at the various vocational schools, colleges, and universities have been useful in reaching non-traditional students and those under 19 who are on their own. Contacts with the Birth-to-Three agencies have also resulted in referrals of eligible children.

Brochures and application packets have worked the best with these contacts as they can keep them and provide them to families that they are in contact with. The application on the Web site is an excellent method for reaching families as more families gain access to the Internet. This also allows agencies and providers to have immediate access to an application if they have never had them or if their supply has not been replenished.

Minority enrollments have increased significantly under the State's SCHIP efforts. The most recent Statistical Enrollment Data System (September 2004) indicates that South Dakota had 2,231 American Indian children enrolled in the SCHIP program. This represents about 22% of the total number of children enrolled in the SCHIP program.

<u>Attachment 6:</u> SCHIP Stuffer; SCHIP Department Survey; SCHIP Department Survey Comparison Chart

Attachment 12: Various SCHIP Outreach Information

SUBSTITUTION OF COVERAGE (CROWD-OUT)

policies.

	States with a separate child health program above 200 through 250% of FPL must complete question 1. All other states with trigger mechanisms should also answer this question.
1.	Does your state cover children between 200 and 250 percent of the FPL or does it identify a trigger mechanism or point at which a substitution prevention policy is instituted? Yes No
	If yes, please identify the trigger mechanisms or point at which your substitution prevention policy is instituted.
2.	States with separate child health programs over 250% of FPL must complete question 2. All other states with substitution prevention provisions should also answer this question. Does your state cover children above 250 percent of the FPL or does it employ substitution prevention provisions? Yes No
	If yes, identify your substitution prevention provisions (waiting periods, etc.).
3.	All States must complete the following 3 questions Describe how substitution of coverage is monitored and measured and the effectiveness of your

SCHIP has specific measures to prevent the program from substituting for coverage under group health plans. The first measure is simply that persons covered by insurance providing hospital and medical services or HMO's are not eligible for benefits under SCHIP. Another measure to prevent substitution is that children are ineligible if they have been covered by a group health plan in the 3 months immediately preceding the application for SCHIP. The Department has adopted a definition of group health plan that includes employers, self-employed plans, employee organizations, and self-insured plans that provide health care directly or otherwise.

The Department requires that insurance information on the persons seeking medical assistance coverage be provided on the application for SCHIP as a measure to avoid substitution for group health coverage. The Department also requires that members of the SCHIP unit cooperate with the Department to determine the availability of coverage. Failure to cooperate may result in loss of eligibility for the unit.

The Department also maintains a database on persons with insurance coverage for persons applying for or receiving medical assistance from the Department under Medicaid, M-SCHIP, or S-SCHIP. The database includes type of coverage, name and address of carrier, policy numbers, plan sponsor, premium payer, and dates of coverage. Information from this database is available to caseworkers to explore potential group health coverage. Caseworkers also have the opportunity to update the information on this database to keep the information up to date.

Targeted low-income children belonging to employees of the State government in South Dakota will not be eligible for SCHIP coverage since the State provides indirect assistance for the coverage of dependants in excess of the cost to cover the employee alone, regardless of the coverage choices made by the family. Children of employees of other government entities in South Dakota will have the coverage evaluated to ensure that there is no meaningful employer contribution (exceeding \$10.00 per month) for group health coverage to dependent children.

South Dakota will continue to study the effects of its enrollment policies on the possible substitution of SCHIP coverage for private group coverage.

4. At the time of application, what percent of applicants are found to have insurance?

M-SCHIP: NC

S-SCHIP: In accordance with South Dakota S-CHIP policy, 78 applicants were found ineligible for S-SCHIP coverage due to already having insurance coverage.

Attachment 13: Crowd Out Analysis; Average Length of Stay Analysis

5. Describe the incidence of substitution. What percent of applicants drop group health plan coverage to enroll in SCHIP?

Our program design provides no incentive for a family to drop insurance coverage because the children who are insured qualify for benefits under Medicaid and only the children who are uninsured are enrolled in SCHIP. In as much as families already made their decision to have insurance, additional benefits of having Medicaid insurance are still available to them.

M-SCHIP: NC

S-SCHIP: During this reporting period, October 2003 through September 2004, no applicants were identified as having dropped group health insurance within 3 months prior to application.

Attachment 13: Crowd Out Analysis; Average Length of Stay Analysis

COORDINATION BETWEEN SCHIP AND MEDICAID

(This subsection should be completed by States with a Separate Child Health Program)

1. Do you have the same redetermination procedures to renew eligibility for Medicaid and SCHIP (e.g., the same verification and interview requirements)? Please explain.

The SCHIP program follows the same eligibility and redetermination process that is used by the Medicaid program for children. Medical reviews are completed annually. The redetermination process is complete prior to the end of the original eligibility period so families receive timely notice and there is no break in coverage if eligibility continues.

Review does not require a signed application or an interview and any requested documentation may be submitted via mail or fax. If at the established review time there is sufficient information available in the case record to redetermine eligibility, then the medical review is considered complete and the family does not have to provide any information.

If information is not already available in the case record, the Department will initiate the review process by contacting the family in the 11th month of eligibility and gathering information to redetermine eligibility. Information may be gathered by any of the following methods: information reported and verified by the client verbally, or in writing; completion of 301R (medical review form); completion of 301M (medical application form); or completion of 301 (Food Stamp/TANF application form). All forms may be completed by the recipient or by the eligibility worker via telephone contact to the family.

Attachment 1: 301-M; 301-R; 203-M; 204-M; 205-M

2. Please explain the process that occurs when a child's eligibility status changes from Medicaid to SCHIP and from SCHIP to Medicaid. Have you identified any challenges? If so, please explain.

The SCHIP program shares all of the functions with Medicaid that have been established in South Dakota. SCHIP forms and procedures are identical to those utilized for Medicaid. This also includes utilization of the same staff to make eligibility determinations and a single computer eligibility determination system. Once a child is determined eligible for Medicaid or SCHIP, the eligibility remains until a determination has been made that the child is no longer eligible for either Medicaid or SCHIP. This seamless process allows children to transfer from one medical program to another without interruption when eligibility criteria changes, but the child remains eligible for Medicaid or SCHIP.

3. Are the same delivery systems (including provider networks) used in Medicaid and SCHIP? Please explain.

Health care services for SCHIP are delivered using the Medicaid delivery and payment systems, including primary care case management (PCCM) and access to specialty health service providers as approved under the South Dakota State Plan Amendment. The State can assure that children receiving services under SCHIP will receive the same beneficiary protections as children receiving Medicaid coverage including grievances and appeals, privacy and confidentiality, respect and non-discrimination, access to emergency services, and an opportunity to participate in health care treatment decision and choice of providers. Benefits delivered to targeted uninsured children under the SCHIP state administered program are identical to the benefits offered under the State's Medicaid program, including EPSDT benefits. The State can also assure that it is providing SCHIP services in an effective and efficient manner by using Medicaid policies and procedures.

Attachment 8: South Dakota State Plan Amendment for Managed Care

ELIGIBILITY REDETERMINATION AND RETENTION

1.	apply and provide descriptions as requested.			
×	Conducts follow-up with clients through caseworkers/outreach workers			
	Sends renewal reminder notices to all families How many notices are sent to the family prior to disenrolling the child from the program? At least 2 At what intervals are reminder notices sent to families (e.g., how many weeks before the end of the current eligibility period is a follow-up letter sent if the renewal has not been received by the State?) 2 months prior, 1 month prior, and 10 days prior to the end of the current eligibility period			
	Sends targeted mailings to selected populations Please specify population(s) (e.g., lower income eligibility groups) Households with disenrolled children			
X	Holds information campaigns			
	Provides a simplified reenrollment process, Please describe efforts (e.g., reducing the length of the application, creating combined Medicaid/SCHIP application) See Section III, Coordination between SCHIP and Medicaid, Question 1			
	Conducts surveys or focus groups with disenrollees to learn more about reasons for disenrollment please describe: See <u>Attachment 7:</u> Disenrollee Survey			
	Other, please explain:			
2.	Which of the above strategies appear to be the most effective? Have you evaluated the effectiveness of any strategies? If so, please describe the evaluation, including data sources and methodology.			
	There is significant evidence to support the assertion that the changes to the application process have facilitated the identification and enrollment of uncovered children. Face value evidence exists in the growth in the number of uninsured children in Medicaid and SCHIP. Annual surveys conducted of the families of children enrolled in the Medicaid and SCHIP programs in during FFY 2004 reported that 97% responded positively to the question on the ease of filling out the application and 99% claimed they encountered no problems with the enrollment process.			
3.	Does your State generate monthly reports or conduct assessments that track the outcomes of individuals who disenroll, or do not reenroll, in SCHIP (e.g., how many obtain other public or private coverage, how many remain uninsured, how many age-out, how many move to a new geographic area)			
	Yes			
	<u>X</u> No			
	When was the monthly report or assessment last conducted?			

If you responded yes to the question above, please provide a summary of the most recent findings (in the table below) from these reports and/or assessments.

Findings from Report/Assessment on Individuals Who Disenroll, or Do Not Reenroll in SCHIP

Total Number of Dis- enrollees	Obtain other public or private coverage		Remain uninsured		Age-out		Move to geograp	-	Other	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent

Please describe the data source (e.g., telephone or mail survey, focus groups) used to derive this information.

COST SHARING

1. Has your State undertaken any assessment of the effects of premiums/enrollment fees on participation in SCHIP? If so, what have you found?

South Dakota SCHIP does not require premiums or enrollment fees.

2. Has your State undertaken any assessment of the effects of cost sharing on utilization of health services in SCHIP? If so, what have you found?

There are no cost share requirements for any medical assistance recipients 18 years old & under in the state of South Dakota.

3. If your state has increased or decreased cost sharing in the past federal fiscal year, has the state undertaken any assessment of the impact of these changes on application, enrollment, disenrollment, and utilization of health services in SCHIP. If so, what have you found?

Not Applicable

PREMIUM ASSISTANCE PROGRAM(S) UNDER SCHIP STATE PLAN

1.	Does your State offer a premium assistance program for children and/or adults using Title XXI funds under any of the following authorities?
	Yes please answer questions below.
	NoX skip to Section IV.
Cł	nildren
	Yes, Check all that apply and complete each question for each authority. Premium Assistance under the State Plan Family Coverage Waiver under the State Plan SCHIP Section 1115 Demonstration Medicaid Section 1115 Demonstration Health Insurance Flexibility & Accountability Demonstration Premium Assistance under the Medicaid State Plan (Section 1906 HIPP)
A	dults
	Yes, Check all that apply and complete each question for each authority. Premium Assistance under the State Plan (Incidentally) Family Coverage Waiver under the State Plan SCHIP Section 1115 Demonstration Medicaid Section 1115 Demonstration Health Insurance Flexibility & Accountability Demonstration Premium Assistance under the Medicaid State Plan (Section 1906 HIPP)
2.	Please indicate which adults your State covers with premium assistance. (Check all that apply.)
	Parents and Caretaker Relatives
	Childless Adults
3.	Briefly describe your program (including current status, progress, difficulties, etc.)
4.	What benefit package does the program use?
5.	Does the program provide wrap-around coverage for benefits or cost sharing?

6. Identify the total number of children and adults enrolled in the premium assistance program for whom Title XXI funds are used during the reporting period (provide the number of adults enrolled in premium assistance even if they were covered incidentally and not via the SCHIP family coverage provision).
Number of adults ever-enrolled during the reporting period
Number of children ever-enrolled during the reporting period
7. Identify the estimated amount of substitution, if any, that occurred or was prevented as a result of your premium assistance program. How was this measured?
8. During the reporting period, what has been the greatest challenge your premium assistance program has experienced?
9. During the reporting period, what accomplishments have been achieved in your premium assistance program?
10. What changes have you made or are planning to make in your premium assistance program during the next fiscal year? Please comment on why the changes are planned.
11. Indicate the effect of your premium assistance program on access to coverage. How was this measured?
12. What do you estimate is the impact of premium assistance on enrollment and retention of children? How was this measured?
13. Identify the total state expenditures for family coverage during the reporting period. (For states offering premium assistance under a family coverage waiver only.)

SECTION IV: PROGRAM FINANCING FOR STATE PLAN

1. Please complete the following table to provide budget information. Describe in narrative any details of your planned use of funds below, including the assumptions on which this budget was based (per member/per month rate, estimated enrollment and source of non-Federal funds). (*Note: This reporting period =Federal Fiscal Year 2004. If you have a combination program you need only submit one budget; programs do not need to be reported separately.*)

COST OF APPROVED SCHIP PLAN

Benefit Costs	2004	2005	2006
Insurance payments	0		
Managed Care	0		
per member/per month rate @ # of eligibles			
Fee for Service	12,989,775	12,052,875	14,092,861
Total Benefit Costs	12,989,775	12,052,875	14,092,861
(Offsetting beneficiary cost sharing payments)			
Net Benefit Costs	\$12,989,775	\$12,052,875	\$14,092,861

Administration Costs

Personnel			
General Administration	661,604	700,00	736,000
Contractors/Brokers (e.g., enrollment contractors)			
Claims Processing			
Outreach/Marketing costs	23,980	25,372	26,676
Other [500]			
Health Services Initiatives			
Total Administration Costs	685,584	725,372	762,676
10% Administrative Cap (net benefit costs ÷ 9)	\$1,443308	\$1,339,208	\$1,565,873

Federal Title XXI Share	10,389,170	9,739,580	11,223,358
State Share	3,286,189	3,038,667	3,632,179

TOTAL COSTS OF APPROVED SCHIP PLAN	\$13,675,359	\$12,778,247	\$14,855,537

2. What were the sources of non-Federal funding used for State match during the reporting period?

State appropriations
County/local funds
Employer contributions
Foundation grants
Private donations
Tobacco settlement
Other (specify)

Attachment 14: CMS 64.21U

SECTION V: 1115 DEMONSTRATION WAIVERS (FINANCED BY SCHIP)

Please reference and summarize attachments that are relevant to specific questions.

1. If you do not have a Demonstration Waiver financed with SCHIP funds skip to Section VI. If you do, please complete the following table showing whom you provide coverage to.

	SCHIP	Non-HIFA Der Eligibility		HIFA Waiver Demonstration Eligibility			
Children	From	% of FPL to	% of FPL	From	% of FPL to	% of FPL	
Parents	From	% of FPL to	% of FPL	From	% of FPL to	% of FPL	
Childless Adults	From	% of FPL to	% of FPL	From	% of FPL to	% of FPL	
Pregnant Women	From	% of FPL to	% of FPL	From	% of FPL to	% of FPL	

2. Identify the total number of children and adults ever enrolled (an unduplicated enrollment count) in your

Benefit Cos	sts for Demonstration Population #1					
	JECTIONS OF DEMONSTRATION 1115 or HIFA)	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
4.	Please provide budget information in approved. <i>Note: This reporting period</i>					
3.	What have you found about the impact of children?	ct of covering adults	s on enrollment,	retention, and	d access to car	·e
	Number of childless ad	ults ever enrolled o	during the repor	ting period in t	the demonstrat	tion
	Number of pregnant wo	omen ever enrolled	during the repo	rting period in	the demonstra	ation
	Number of parents ever	r enrolled during the	e reporting perion	od in the demo	nstration	

Number of **children** ever enrolled during the reporting period in the demonstration

Benefit Costs for Demonstration Population #2
(e.g., parents)

per member/per month rate @ # of eligibles

Total Benefit Costs for Waiver Population #1

(e.g., children)
Insurance Payments
Managed care

Fee for Service

(e.g., parents)			
Insurance Payments			
Managed care			
per member/per month rate @ # of eligibles			

SCHIP demonstration during the reporting period.

			1
Fee for Service			
Total Benefit Costs for Waiver Population #2			
Benefit Costs for Demonstration Population #3			
(e.g., pregnant women)			
Insurance Payments			
Managed care			
per member/per month rate @ # of eligibles			
Fee for Service			
Total Benefit Costs for Waiver Population #3			
Benefit Costs for Demonstration Population #4			
(e.g., childless adults)			
Insurance Payments			
Managed care			
per member/per month rate @ # of eligibles			
Fee for Service			
Total Benefit Costs for Waiver Population #3			
Total Benefit Costs for Walver F Opulation #3			
Total Benefit Costs			
(Offsetting Beneficiary Cost Sharing Payments)			
Net Benefit Costs (Total Benefit Costs - Offsetting			
Beneficiary Cost Sharing Payments)			
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		I I	
Administration Costs			
Personnel			
General Administration			
Contractors/Brokers (e.g., enrollment contractors)			
Claims Processing			
Outreach/Marketing costs			
Other (specify) [500]			
Total Administration Costs			
10% Administrative Cap (net benefit costs ÷ 9)			
		_	
Federal Title XXI Share			
State Share			
TOTAL COSTS OF DEMONSTRATION			

When was your budget last updated (please include month, day and year)?

Please provide a description of any assumptions that are included in your calculations.

Other notes relevant to the budget:

SECTION VI: PROGRAM CHALLENGES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. For the reporting period, please provide an overview of your state's political and fiscal environment as it relates to health care for low income, uninsured children and families, and how this environment impacted SCHIP.

During federal fiscal year 2004, the economy of South Dakota continued to suffer as a result of a major drought throughout much of the state in years 2001 through 2003. The drought has had a significant impact on South Dakota's agriculturally-based economy. Farmers and ranchers of South Dakota have not fully recovered from the severe losses suffered in previous years. As a result, more and more families qualified for medical assistance programs. Since agriculture drives South Dakota's economy, this has a tumbling effect on other industries in the state. The summer of 2004 was more productive for farmers and ranchers, and South Dakota's economy has begun to rebound recently, although not as quickly as we'd like.

2. During the reporting period, what has been the greatest challenge your program has experienced?

The slow rebound of South Dakota's economy continued to have a negative impact, and more individuals qualified for medical assistance. The greatest challenge continues to be the fiscal impact of paying for medical services for more eligibles than ever before. South Dakota has again had to balance its budget by using reserve funds. This will bring additional inquiry to the program by Legislators, who may try to mandate program changes in an effort to cover the budget deficit.

3. During the reporting period, what accomplishments have been achieved in your program?

In FFY 2004, South Dakota added a total of 2,082 uninsured children to Medicaid, M-SCHIP, and S-SCHIP. Enrollment breakouts per category are as follows:

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Medicaid} = \underline{1,284} \\ \text{M-SCHIP} = & \underline{603} \\ \text{S-SCHIP} = & 195 \end{array}$

Data taken from South Dakota Medicaid and SCHIP programs enrollment data. (See <u>Attachment 10:</u> Quarterly Enrollments in Medicaid, M-SCHIP, and S-SCHIP.)

Minority enrollments have increased significantly under the State's SCHIP efforts. American Indians are the largest minority population living in South Dakota. Approximately 7% of South Dakota's population is American Indian, primarily residing on the 9 Indian Reservations within the State's boundaries. The most recent Statistical Enrollment Data System (June 2004) indicates that South Dakota had 2,265 American Indian children enrolled in the SCHIP program. This represents about 21% of the total number of children enrolled in the SCHIP program.

4. What changes have you made or are planning to make in your SCHIP program during the next fiscal year? Please comment on why the changes are planned.

There are a number of cost containment measures that are being considered for both Medicaid and SCHIP in South Dakota. Some of the more popular cost containment measures are implementing a prior authorization requirement on certain classes of prescription drugs, implementing disease management programs in an effort to improve quality of care and prevent unnecessary hospitalizations, and possibly increasing audit functions or expanding additional cost avoidance programs.